



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/021,375	10/30/2001	Benjamin Richards	ONW-1	2529

20808 7590 03/07/2007
BROWN & MICHAELS, PC
400 M & T BANK BUILDING
118 NORTH TIOGA ST
ITHACA, NY 14850

EXAMINER

VAN DOREN, BETH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3623

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/07/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/021,375

Applicant(s)

RICHARDS ET. AL.

Examiner

Beth Van Doren

Art Unit

3623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 November 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Prosecution has been re-opened in response to the Appeal Brief filed on 11/20/2006. Accordingly, the following is a Non-Final Office Action. Claims 1-18 are pending in this application.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 11/20/06, with respect to the rejections of claims 1-18 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground of rejection is made. See rejections that follow.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

4. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 1 is a method claim that recites people as part of the method. People are not considered statutory subject matter. For a method claim to be considered statutory, it must include functional steps performed. However, a step cannot claim the person performing the step. Since claim 1 recites people as part of the method, claim 1 is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 2-11 depend from claim 1 and therefore contain the same deficiencies.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

Art Unit: 3623

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 1-11 and claims 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites "a method for retrieving shipping platforms which have been sent by a plurality of original shippers to a plurality of end recipients through a coordinator for reuse". However, in the body of claim 1, it appears that the end recipient is placing the shipping platforms for sale on a computer site, without the original shipper's consent (i.e. the original shipper must be notified of the posting for sale). Therefore, it is unclear as to how the preamble of the claim specifically matches the body of the claims. Further, it is unclear who has ownership of the shipping platforms and what the relationship is between the parties of the method. It is specifically unclear as to whether the claim is directed to a method for retrieving platforms by an original shipper owning the platforms using a third-party manager or to a method for selling used shipping platforms, wherein the original shipper is merely a buyer using the coordinator's venue. This is supported by limitations a and b of claim 1, as well as claim 2, where it appears that the platforms are marked with symbols identifying the coordinator of the system, not the original shipper. Thus, for examination purposes, Examiner has construed the method to be a third party resale system, wherein the original shipper is merely a customer who has the ability to buy used shipping platforms, such as those previously held by the original shipper.

Examiner further points out that it is not clear in the body of the claim what the relationship is between the "original shipper" and "end recipient" (and thus the listed shipping platform of the

Art Unit: 3623

end recipient). In step b), types of shipping platforms (such as wooden or 48"X 40") are associated with an original shipper. Thus a type, and not a specific item, is associated with a shipper. In step c), an end recipient lists a shipping platform that is a certain type. In step d), the coordinator notifies an original shipper that the type of platform has been listed by an end recipient. Thus, the claim language does not specifically link the shipper to a specific pallet, but rather a type of pallet, where the listed pallet is not necessarily previously owned by the "original shipper". This is supported by the preamble, which states that a plurality of shippers ship to a plurality of end recipients (and thus the two in the body are not specifically linked). Therefore, there is no specific claimed relationship between the original shipper, the end recipient, and the listed pallet, and thus it is unclear in the claim what makes a shipper "original" or a recipient an "end" recipient beyond mere labels and the fact that, perhaps, the shipping platform listed by the end recipient is used. Therefore, for examination purposes, examiner has construed that there is no specific correlation between the "original" shipper and the "end" recipient in the claim, beyond the type information and the original shipper's preference for a type of platform, which the end recipient is selling. Clarification is required.

Claims 2-11 depend from claim 1 and therefore contain the same deficiencies.

Further, claims 4 and 6 recite "the shipper paying the coordinator". It is not specifically clear as to who "the shipper" is since there is no antecedent basis for "the shipper" in claim 1. For examination purposes, the shipper has been construed as the original shipper. Clarification is required.

Claim 14 involves a shipper paying the coordinator a sales amount for the platform and the coordinator paying the end recipient a percentage of the sales amount. Similar to the

Art Unit: 3623

rationale above with regards to claim 1, it is not clear if the shipping platforms are being managed by a third party manager or if they are being resold. Clarification is required.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 5-6 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1-3 and 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meehan et al. (U.S.2002/0029187) in view of Chep. The following disclose aspects and features of Chep:

- i. Screenshots of Chep.com (www.chep.com) retrieved from archive.org, dated 6/20/2001 (referred to herein as reference C);
- ii. Article "Outlook for Third-Party Management" by LeBlanc, dated 03/01/1999 (referred to herein as reference D).

As per claim 1, Meehan et al. teaches a method comprising the steps of:

Art Unit: 3623

a) the coordinator issuing an identification for a plurality of types of items (See paragraph 9-10, 23, 27, wherein different categories are established by the coordinator/site that identify types of items);

b) the coordinator creating a remotely accessible file describing each of the plurality of types of items on a computer site (See paragraphs 9, 19, 23m wherein a database with files are created on the computer site of the coordinator), in which each type of item is associated with an first party (See paragraphs 23 and 27, wherein the first user is registered in the system associated with a first type of item);

c) the coordinator accepting a listing from a second party of at least one item of one of the types of items identified in step (a) for sale at the computer site (See paragraph 9-10, 23, wherein an item is listed for sale);

d) the coordinator notifying the first party associated in step (b) with the type of item of the listing of the at least one item listed by the second party in step (c) (See paragraphs 23 and 27, wherein the first user is notified of the sale of an item based on the type/category of the item).

However, Meehan et al. does not expressly disclose that the item is a shipping platform or that a type of shipping platform is associated with an original shipper per se.

Chep discloses an online tool that allows the ordering and tracking of the items of shipping platforms (See page 8, section 2, which discloses shipping platforms (pallets and containers to be ordered and monitored). Chep.com discloses that the shipping platforms have an identification and type associated therewith (See page 6, page 8, sections 1-2, page 11, section 11). Chep.com further discloses that an original shipper uses an online ordering and reporting

Art Unit: 3623

system that allows the shippers to order shipping containers and report movements. Thus each type of shipping platform ordered and used by a shipper is associated with a shipper in the Chep system (See reference C, page 8, 10, page 11, sections 1-2, and page 12, wherein shipping platforms and equipment are tracked and monitored by the system. See pages 3-4 and 6-7, wherein different types of pallets can be owned and tracked by Chep).

Both Meehan et al. and Chep are concerned with the movement of goods. Meehan et al. discloses an Internet website for the selling items, the items being associated with a category that is of interest to a first party. Chep discloses that the item of interest is a shipping platform, where the movement of the pool of platforms is managed and the platforms are labeled with an identification mark. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include that the items of Meehan et al. are shipping platforms in order to more efficiently facilitate the sale of goods between a seller and a buyer interested in a certain category/type of items. See paragraph 9, 23, and 27 of Meehan et al.

As per claim 2, Meehan et al. does not expressly disclose and Chep discloses, after step (a), of marking the identification and a symbol representing a coordinator onto a plurality of the shipping platforms (See reference C, page 3, section 1, pages 4-5, page 6, section 1, wherein a plurality of shipping platforms are marked with a symbol and the CHEP logo).

Both Meehan et al. and Chep are concerned with the movement of goods. Meehan et al. discloses an Internet website for the selling items, the items being associated with a category that is of interest to a first party. Chep discloses that the item of interest is a shipping platform, where the movement of the pool of platforms is managed and the platforms are labeled with an identification mark. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

Art Unit: 3623

the time of the invention to include issuing an identification for the item of the system of Meehan et al. in order to more efficiently identify the category of assets to the buyers that meet the buyers' specifications.

As per claim 3, Meehan et al. does not expressly disclose marking the shipping platforms with a computer address for the computer site on the shipping platforms. Chep discloses marking the identification and a symbol representing a coordinator onto a plurality of the shipping platforms (See reference C, page 3, section 1, pages 4-5, page 6, section 1, wherein a plurality of shipping platforms are marked with a symbol and the CHEP logo). However, while Chep discloses marking the platform with a logo, Chep.com does not expressly disclose that the logo includes marking a computer address for the computer site on the shipping platforms.

Both Meehan et al. and Chep are concerned with the movement of goods. Meehan et al. discloses an Internet website for the selling items, the items being associated with a category that is of interest to a first party. Chep discloses that the item of interest is a shipping platform, where the movement of the pool of platforms is managed and the platforms are labeled with an identification mark. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include issuing an identification for a shipping platform in order to more efficiently identify assets to the buyers that meet the buyers' specifications.

Furthermore, Chep also discloses the reuse and exchange of shipping platforms, the platforms being marked by a logo for identification. Labeling a product with a logo including a website address is well known in e-commerce as a way to pass on information to a user concerning the product. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a website address in the logo of Chep in order to increase

Art Unit: 3623

the recognition and knowledge of the platform by providing a means to identify and locate information concerning the platform. See reference C, page 6, that discusses identifying markings on the shipping platforms.

As per claims 10-11, Meehan et al. discloses issuing an identification for an item based on a type of the item (See paragraph 9-10, 23, wherein an item is listed for sale). Meehan et al. further discloses wherein the file created in step (b) comprises item specifications (See paragraphs 9-10).

However, Meehan et al. does not expressly disclose that the type of item is a shipping platform.

Chep.com discloses that the item is a shipping platform (See pages 6 and 8).

Both Meehan et al. and Chep are concerned with the movement of goods. Meehan et al. discloses an Internet website for the selling items, the items being associated with a category that is of interest to a first party. Chep discloses that the item of interest is a shipping platform, where the movement of the pool of platforms is managed and the platforms are labeled with an identification mark. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include that the items of Meehan et al. are shipping platforms in order to more efficiently facilitate the sale of goods between a seller and a buyer interested in a certain category/type of items. See paragraph 9, 23, and 27 of Meehan et al.

10. Claims 12-13 and 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chep in view of Berstis (U.S. 2002/0082974). The following disclose aspects and features of Chep:

Art Unit: 3623

- i. Screenshots of Chep.com (www.chep.com) retrieved from archive.org, dated 6/20/2001 (referred to herein as reference C);
- ii. Article "Outlook for Third-Party Management" by LeBlanc, dated 03/01/1999 (referred to herein as reference D).

As per claim 12, Chep.com discloses a method for recycling and reuse of a shipper's shipping platforms sent from a plurality of end recipients through a coordinator, comprising the steps of: a) requesting the coordinator to identify a plurality of shipping platforms on the computer site and to create a remotely accessible file describing the shipping platforms and associated types on a computer site associated with the coordinator (See reference C, pages 3-6, wherein the coordinator (CHEP) identifies different types of shipping platforms available through the management system);

c) shipping products on at least some of the plurality of shipping platforms to at least one end recipient (See reference C, page 8, sections 1-2, page 10, page 12, page 17, section 1, and page 20, wherein the shipping platforms are delivered);

d) presenting by coordinator listed shipping platforms of a type associated with the shipper of step (a), which had been listed after use by an end recipient, the listing occurring at the computer site associated with the coordinator (See reference C, pages 3-6, wherein the coordinator (CHEP) identifies different types of shipping platforms available through the management system. The third party site lists shipping platforms that are used by the shipper. These platforms are ready for reuse. See also page 7, page 8, sections 1-2, page 11, and page 18); and

e) receiving at least some of the listed shipping platforms listed in step (d) (See reference C, page 3, page 7, page 8, sections 1-2, page 11, and page 18, wherein customers receive some of the listed shipping platforms).

However, Chep does not expressly disclose listing shipping platforms by quantity. Further, Chep does not expressly disclose accepting a notification from the coordinator of listed shipping platforms.

Berstis discloses listing items by quantity and accepting a notification from the coordinator of listed items (See paragraphs 11, 30-31, 35, which discloses listing a quantity of items and sending a notification to a buyer of the listing).

Both Berstis and Chep are concerned with the movement of goods. Chep discloses a system that allows a shipper to order and manage the movement of shipping platforms. Berstis allows a user to store in a profile an identification of an item needed by the user. The profile includes a quantity desired. The user is notified when another user posts the item for offer. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a desired quantity and to notify the user when the items are listed in order to more efficiently match items to requirements of users. See paragraphs 11 and 35 of Berstis.

As per claim 13, Chep.com discloses marking the identification and a symbol representing a coordinator onto a plurality of the shipping platforms (See reference C, page 3, section 1, pages 4-5, page 6, section 1, wherein a plurality of shipping platforms are marked with a symbol and the CHEP logo). However, while Chep.com discloses marking the platform with a logo, Chep.com does not expressly disclose that the logo includes marking a computer address for the computer site on the shipping platforms. Berstis also discloses a unique identifier for the

Art Unit: 3623

item of the system (See paragraphs 11 and 30), but also does not expressly disclose that the identifier includes marking a computer address for the computer site on the item.

Chep.com disclosed means for effective interchange of shipping platforms, wherein the platforms being marked by a logo for identification and users have electronic tools to track and monitor shipping platforms. Berstis also discloses a unique identifier for the item of the system. Labeling a product with a logo including a website address is well known in e-commerce as a way to pass on information to a user concerning the product. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a website address in the logo of Chep in order to increase the recognition and knowledge of the platform by providing a means to identify and locate information concerning the platform. See reference C, page 6, that discusses identifying markings on the shipping platforms.

As per claim 17, Chep discloses issuing an identification for a shipping platform, wherein the identification is issued identification based on at least a type of the shipping platform and a size of the shipping platform (See reference C, pages 3-6, wherein the identification is based on the type of product).

As per claim 18, Chep.com discloses wherein the file created in step (b) comprises at least one item selected from a list comprising: the identification issued to the shipping platform; a shipper profile; an image of the shipping platform; repair specifications for the shipping platform; shipping platform specifications; and the annual usage of the shipping platform (See reference C, pages 3-6).

Art Unit: 3623

11. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meehan et al. (U.S. 2002/0029187) in view of Chep.com (as set forth above) and in further view of Mori et al. (U.S. 6,044,363).

As per claim 4, Meehan et al. discloses the sales of an item using a coordinator and Chep.com discloses that the item is a shipping platform, as set forth above with respect to claim 1. However, neither Meehan et al. nor Chep.com discloses coordinating shipment of the shipping platforms from the second party ("end recipient") to the first party ("original shipper").

Mori et al. discloses coordinating shipment of the items from the second party to the first party (See column 4, lines 10-30, wherein the item is shipped via the auction system).

Meehan et al. and Chep.com are combinable for the reasons set forth above. Further, both Mori et al. and Meehan et al. disclose online auction sites that coordinate the buying of an item by a first party from a second party. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the management of shipping of the purchased item from the seller to the buyer in order to more efficiently transfer the product of the seller to the buyer through automated means.

12. Claims 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meehan et al. in view of Chep (as set forth above) and in further view of Canadian Pallet Council (CPC) (www.cpcpallet.com). The references used to disclose the aspects of Chep.com and Tradeout.com are set forth above.

As per claims 7-9, neither Meehan et al. does not expressly disclose repair standards associated with the listed items.

Art Unit: 3623

Chep discloses that the items are shipping platforms and that third party management services repair the shipping containers (See reference D, page 1, section 1). However, Chep does not expressly disclose information on repair standards for the shipping platforms, wherein the shipping platforms are repaired in accordance with the repair standards in the file.

CPC discloses presenting and storing information on repair standards for the shipping platforms on a computer site, wherein the shipping platforms are repaired in accordance with the repair standards (See page 2, section 1, page 4, section 1, page 6, section 1, page 7, page 8, which disclose repair information and standards, wherein qualified persons repair the shipping platforms in accordance with the standards). CPC further discloses that this file includes repair standards that comprise at least one item selected from a list comprising: a description of repair policy; general guidelines; stringer board repairs; excessive wear and tear and contamination; nails and hardware; and lumber that can be used to repair the shipping platforms (See page 2, section 1, page 4, section 1, page 6, section 1, page 7, page 8, which discusses the uniform specifications of the pallet, used in repairs, such as repair policy, contamination, nails and hardware, etc.).

Meehan et al. and Chep.com are combinable for the reasons set forth above. Further, Chep discloses that the coordinator repairs the shipping containers. CPC discloses repair standard information. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include repair standards in the information included when repairing the platforms of Chep in order to increase user confidence in the product (i.e. platforms) by presenting the standards used to maintain the products of the third party manager.

Art Unit: 3623

13. Claims 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chep (as set forth above) in view of Berstis (U.S. 2002/0082974) and in further view of Canadian Pallet Council (CPC) (www.cpcpallet.com). The references used to disclose the aspects of Chep are set forth above.

As per claims 15 and 16, Chep.com discloses creating a file describing the shipping platform on a computer site (See reference C, pages 3-6, wherein the coordinator (CHEP) identifies different types of shipping platforms available through the management system). Chep.com further discloses that the third party management service repairs the shipping containers (See reference D, page 1, section 1). However, neither Chep.com nor Berstis expressly disclose that this file comprises information on repair standards for the shipping platforms, the repair standards comprising at least one item selected from a list comprising: a description of repair policy; general guidelines; stringer board repairs; excessive wear and tear and contamination; nails and hardware; and lumber that can be used to repair the shipping platforms.

CPC discloses presenting and storing information on repair standards for the shipping platforms on a computer site, wherein the shipping platforms are repaired in accordance with the repair standards (See page 2, section 1, page 4, section 1, page 6, section 1, page 7, page 8, which disclose repair information and standards, wherein qualified persons repair the shipping platforms in accordance with the standards). CPC further teaches that the repair standards comprise at least one item selected from a list comprising: a description of repair policy; general guidelines; stringer board repairs; excessive wear and tear and contamination; nails and hardware; and lumber that can be used to repair the shipping platforms (See page 2, section 1,

Art Unit: 3623

page 4, section 1, page 6, section 1, page 7, page 8, which discusses the uniform specifications of the pallet, used in repairs, such as repair policy, contamination, nails and hardware, etc).

Chep and Berstis are combinable for the reasons set forth above. Further, both Chep and CPC disclose means for the cost effective interchange of shipping platforms. Chep disclose repairing the platforms. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include repair standards in the information included when repairing the platforms of Chep in order to increase user confidence in the product (i.e. platforms) by presenting the standards used to maintain the products of the third party manager.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Walker et al. (U.S. 6,108,639) discloses a system that manages the exchange of used, collectable items.

Whitman (U.S. 2002/0019785) teaches a system that coordinates the resale of items that were previously purchased by an end recipient and not wanted.

Walker et al. (U.S. 6,658,390) discloses a system that coordinates the resale of a previously sold item.

Abhyanker (U.S. 6,915, 274) discloses offering used goods for sale via a virtual seller (coordinator).

Art Unit: 3623

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Beth Van Doren whose telephone number is (571) 272-6737.


The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on (571) 272-6729. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

lwd
bvd

March 2, 2007


TARIQ R. HAFIZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800